

CP Violation and Lifetime Differences of Neutral B Mesons from Correlated $B^0\overline{B}^0$ Pairs

Nita Sinha ^{*} and Rahul Sinha [†]

Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India.

(19 May 1998)

Abstract

We present a technique to determine the CP violating phases, as well as, the lifetime differences of the mass eigenstates for both B_d and B_s , by considering correlated $B\overline{B}$ pairs produced at the Υ resonances. We do not require a detailed time dependent study, but only partial time integrated rates, with the tag time, either preceding or following the decay of the other B meson to a final state f . f may be a CP eigenstate or a non- CP eigenstate.

Typeset using REVTeX

^{*}e-mail: nita@imsc.ernet.in

[†]e-mail: sinha@imsc.ernet.in

The turn of this century will mark the beginning of a new era in the study of CP violation, the origin of which is not yet understood. In the standard model, CP violation is parametrized by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix [1], and the B meson system is expected to provide a unique testing ground for this hypothesis. A large number of dedicated B physics experiments will start collecting data in the near future and it is expected that several B parameters will be measured. One of the first to be operational are the asymmetric B factories at PEP-II and KEK-B. After two decades of detailed theoretical studies of possible signals of CP violation in B mesons, it is hoped that CP violation will finally be seen using time dependent asymmetries [2] in neutral B mesons. However, few strategies exist [3–5] for the challenging measurement of the small lifetime difference of the two mass eigenstates.

In this letter we propose a technique to search for CP violation, as well as, measure the lifetime differences of the two neutral B (B_d or B_s) mass eigenstates. We consider coherent $B^0\overline{B}^0$ pairs produced at Υ resonances, where, one of the neutral B meson decay acts as a flavour tag (which for the purpose of illustration we take to be a semileptonic decay), while the other, decays to a hadronic state f or $\bar{f}$ (*i.e.*, $\Upsilon \rightarrow B^0\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow l^\pm f(\bar{f})X^\mp$). The hadronic state f is chosen to be one, into which both B^0 and $\overline{B}^0$ can decay. In the absence of CP violation, the number of such events with an l^+ and f or $\bar{f}$ in the final state, equals those with an l^- . In addition for equal lifetimes, if we add the number of events to f and $\bar{f}$, tagged by the same charge lepton, then the number of events where the semileptonic decay precedes the hadronic, equals those in which the semileptonic decay follows the hadronic. Using these facts, we construct certain ratios of number of events, which in the absence of CP violation and/or equal lifetimes, should each be identically half. Such ratios can be obtained by comparing the number of events where the semileptonic decay is selectively time ordered with respect to the hadronic decay, to that where all such events are added irrespective of the time ordering. Hence, the deviation of these ratios from half would provide a remarkable signal of CP violation and/or unequal lifetimes. Some of these ratios are unique, as these cannot be recast into asymmetries of particle–antiparticle events, as is done conventionally.

In the case of CP eigenstates f (*e.g.* $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_s$), these ratios enable us to determine not only the CP violating weak phase but most importantly, the width difference ($\Delta\Gamma$) of the neutral B mass eigenstates as well. Non- CP eigenstates where f and $\bar{f}$ are identifiable (*e.g.* $B_d \rightarrow D^\pm \pi^\mp$), also allow the determination of the width difference along with the weak phase, strong phases and the amplitudes involved. In cases where the final states f and $\bar{f}$ cannot be separated (*e.g.* $B_d \rightarrow D^0(\bar{D}^0)\pi^0$), our approach can be particularly useful since we add f and $\bar{f}$ events. However, in such a case the width difference cannot be determined, in general, from the same mode.

Calculation of the box-diagrams for $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing [6] leads to a tiny estimate for the width difference in B_d , of the order $\Delta\Gamma < 0.01 \Gamma$. However, for B_s meson, the width difference can be larger, $\Delta\Gamma \sim 0.1 \Gamma$ [3,4]. Recent data [7] on exclusive two-body B decays, indicates significant gluonic penguin amplitudes. Sizable contribution to $\Delta\Gamma$, via the absorptive part of dipenguin diagrams [8] can thus be expected. This contribution has not been included in the above estimates for $\Delta\Gamma$. Hence, one should not preclude a measurable width difference even in the case of B_d mesons.

The decay amplitude for a coherent $B^0\bar{B}^0$ state, with a B decaying to l^+X^- at time t_0 , and the other B decaying to f at time t is given by [9],

$$A[(l^+)_{t_0}, (f)_t] = \langle l^+X^- | H | B^0(t_0) \rangle \langle f | H | \bar{B}^0(t) \rangle + (-1)^C \langle l^+X^- | H | \bar{B}^0(t_0) \rangle \langle f | H | B^0(t) \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where, C is the charge parity of the $B^0\bar{B}^0$ state. The hadronic matrix elements for pure B^0 and $\bar{B}^0$ may be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f | H | B^0 \rangle &= A_1 e^{i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} \\ \langle f | H | \bar{B}^0 \rangle &= A_2 e^{i\phi_2} e^{i\delta_2} \\ \langle \bar{f} | H | B^0 \rangle &= A_2 e^{-i\phi_2} e^{i\delta_2} \\ \langle \bar{f} | H | \bar{B}^0 \rangle &= A_1 e^{-i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where, ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are the weak phases, δ_1, δ_2 are the strong phases, and A_1, A_2 are the magnitudes

of the amplitudes respectively. We restrict our analysis to final states with just one weak phase in each of the above. Using, the time evolution equations for initially pure B^0 and $\overline{B}^0$ states, we may rewrite Eq.(1), as well as those corresponding to, $l^- f, l^+ \bar{f}, l^- \bar{f}$ in the final state as,

$$\begin{aligned}
A[l^+ f] &= \xi F A_1 e^{i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} (C_+ + C_- r |\xi|^{-1} e^{i\phi} e^{i\delta}) \\
A[l^- f] &= -\bar{F} A_1 e^{i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} (C_- + C_+ r |\xi|^{-1} e^{i\phi} e^{i\delta}) \\
A[l^+ \bar{f}] &= F A_1 e^{i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} (C_+ r |\xi| e^{-i\phi} e^{i\delta} + C_-) \\
A[l^- \bar{f}] &= -\bar{F} \xi^{-1} A_1 e^{i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} (C_- r |\xi| e^{-i\phi} e^{i\delta} + C_+),
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where,

$$r = A_2/A_1, \quad \phi = \phi_2 - \phi_1 - 2\beta, \quad \delta = \delta_2 - \delta_1,$$

$$C_{\pm} = g_+(t_0)g_{\mp}(t) + (-1)^C g_-(t_0)g_{\pm}(t), \quad F(\bar{F}) = \langle l^{\pm} X^{\mp} | H | B^0(\overline{B}^0) \rangle,$$

$$g_{\pm} = e^{-(\frac{\Gamma}{2} + iM)t} \left\{ \cos\left[\left(\Delta M - i\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}\right)\frac{t}{2}\right], i \sin\left[\left(\Delta M - i\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}\right)\frac{t}{2}\right] \right\},$$

with $|F|^2 = |\bar{F}|^2$; $\xi = \left|\frac{p}{q}\right| e^{2i\beta}$, where the parameters p and q relate [10] the flavor eigenstates to the mass eigenstates.

Note that all the amplitudes in the above equation, involve the same weak phase ϕ . All interference terms involving this phase are washed out for the Υ decays ($C=1$), if we evaluate the time integrated rates. In what follows we restrict our discussion to $C = 1$ case only. While detailed time dependent studies can always be used to determine the CP violating phase and the finite width difference, during the initial stages of operation, limited statistics may not allow one to do so. However, it will still be possible to obtain information on these, by partial time integrated rates. We implement this by choosing the decay into one of the $l^{\pm}$ or $f(\bar{f})$ states to take place at any time, while the decay to the other state occurs either before or after it, *i.e.* the decay times are ordered with respect to each other.

We consider the sum of events where the semileptonic decays to l^+ precedes the hadronic decay and that to l^- occurs after the hadronic decay. We call such events opposite time events. Similarly, the like time events are defined to be those where both l^+ and l^- decays

precede the hadronic decays. A remarkable signal of CP violation or finite lifetime difference is obtained by taking the ratio of the opposite time or like time events respectively, to the total number of events. The advantage of considering ratios of number of events, is that systematic errors tend to cancel.

Using Eq.(3) the two ratios can be written as,

$$R_1 = \frac{N_{<}(l^+f) + N_{<}(l^+\bar{f}) + N_{>}(l^-f) + N_{>}(l^-\bar{f})}{N(l^+f) + N(l^+\bar{f}) + N(l^-f) + N(l^-\bar{f})} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \epsilon_1)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}[1 - ((1 - y^2)\frac{x}{1 + x^2} \sin \phi + \frac{a_u}{2} y \cos \phi) \frac{2r}{1 + r^2} \cos \delta] \quad (4)$$

$$R_2 = \frac{N_{<}(l^+f) + N_{<}(l^+\bar{f}) + N_{<}(l^-f) + N_{<}(l^-\bar{f})}{N(l^+f) + N(l^+\bar{f}) + N(l^-f) + N(l^-\bar{f})} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \epsilon_2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}[1 - (\frac{a_u}{2} (1 - y^2)\frac{x}{1 + x^2} \sin \phi + y \cos \phi) \frac{2r}{1 + r^2} \cos \delta] \quad (5)$$

where, $N_{<}$ denotes the number of events where the hadronic decay precedes the semileptonic, *i.e.* $t < t_0$, while $N_{>}$ denotes the number of events where the hadronic decay occurs after the semileptonic, *i.e.* $t > t_0$; N without the subscript represents the integrated numbers, where each of t_0 and t runs from 0 to ∞ . Also $x = \frac{\Delta M}{\Gamma}$, $y = \frac{\Delta \Gamma}{2\Gamma}$, ΔM and $\Delta \Gamma$ denote the mass and width differences of the two B mass eigenstates respectively, while Γ is the average width of the two states. In the above we have used the following integrals,

$$\int_0^\infty dt_0 \int_0^{t_0} dt |C_+|^2 = \int_0^\infty dt_0 \int_{t_0}^\infty dt |C_+|^2 = \frac{x^2 + y^2}{4\Gamma^2(1 + x^2)(1 - y^2)}$$

$$\int_0^\infty dt_0 \int_0^{t_0} dt |C_-|^2 = \int_0^\infty dt_0 \int_{t_0}^\infty dt |C_-|^2 = \frac{2 + x^2 - y^2}{4\Gamma^2(1 + x^2)(1 - y^2)}$$

$$\int_0^\infty dt_0 \int_0^{t_0} dt C_\mp C_\pm^* = - \int_0^\infty dt_0 \int_{t_0}^\infty dt C_\mp C_\pm^* = \frac{-y(x^2 + 1) \pm ix(1 - y^2)}{4\Gamma^2(1 + x^2)(1 - y^2)}, \quad (6)$$

and we have related $|\xi|$ to the charge asymmetry in like sign dilepton events defined by,

$$a_u = \frac{N(l^+l^+) - N(l^-l^-)}{N(l^+l^+) + N(l^-l^-)} = \frac{|\xi|^4 - 1}{|\xi|^4 + 1}, \quad (7)$$

implying,

$$|\xi| \pm \frac{1}{|\xi|} = \frac{(1 + a_u)^{1/2} \pm (1 - a_u)^{1/2}}{(1 - a_u^2)^{1/4}} \approx \{2, a_u\}(1 + O(a_u^2) + \dots). \quad (8)$$

As is well known, a_{ll} is a signature of direct CP violation. In the standard model a_{ll} is expected to be very small $\approx 10^{-3} - 10^{-4}$. Upper bound for B_d is $|a_{ll}| < 0.18$ [11,12]. While our discussions can be generalized for arbitrary a_{ll} , we take a_{ll} to be small, retaining, in Eq.(8), only linear order terms in a_{ll} . Expressing $|\xi|$ in terms of the observable a_{ll} , has the advantage that one makes no assumption regarding the size of $\text{Im}\epsilon_B$ or $\text{Re}\epsilon_B$ [13]. An exchange of $l^+ \leftrightarrow l^-$ or $N_< \leftrightarrow N_>$ in the ratios R_1 and R_2 results in switching the sign of ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 . It may be pointed out that any deviation of R_1 from half is an unambiguous signature of CP violation. R_1 and R_2 are constructed such that R_1 measures $\sin \phi$, whereas R_2 measures y , both with correction terms of the order a_{ll} .

We can also obtain the following unusual but remarkable signals of: *i*) CP violation in the limit $y \rightarrow 0$, *ii*) non-vanishing width difference in the limit $\phi \rightarrow 0$,

$$R_3 = \frac{N_<(l^+ f) + N_<(l^+ \bar{f})}{N(l^+ f) + N(l^+ \bar{f})} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \epsilon_3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \frac{2r}{1+r^2} \cos \delta \left(\frac{x}{1+x^2} (1-y^2) \sin \phi + y \cos \phi \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} a_{ll} \right) \left(1 + \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2(1+x^2)} a_{ll} \right)^{-1} \right] \quad (9)$$

$$R_4 = \frac{N_<(l^- f) + N_<(l^- \bar{f})}{N(l^- f) + N(l^- \bar{f})} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \epsilon_4)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \frac{2r}{1+r^2} \cos \delta \left(\frac{x}{1+x^2} (1-y^2) \sin \phi - y \cos \phi \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} a_{ll} \right) \left(1 - \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2(1+x^2)} a_{ll} \right)^{-1} \right]. \quad (10)$$

The above ratios are unique, as the corresponding deviations from half (*i.e.* $\epsilon_3, \epsilon_4 \neq 0$), cannot be rewritten in terms of an asymmetry between particle and antiparticle events, but only as an asymmetry of $t < t_0$ and $t > t_0$ events. Only if $\Delta\Gamma = 0$, as well as $|\xi| = 1$, R_3 and R_4 can be rewritten in terms of asymmetries of the usual type. It may be pointed out that R_3, R_4 are linearly independent of R_1, R_2 only for $|\xi| \neq 1$. For $a_{ll} = 0$ and $y = 0$, we get, $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_3 = -\epsilon_4$ and $\epsilon_2 = 0$. We wish to point out that $R_1, \dots, R_4$ do not exhaust the list of independent ratios. When f and $\bar{f}$ are distinguishable, then the ratios formed by subtracting f and $\bar{f}$ events, corresponding to each of $R_1, \dots, R_4$ can also be written down.

CP eigenstate f : If f is a CP eigenstate, $\delta = 0$, $r = n_f$ (where $n_f = \pm 1$, is the CP parity of f). Hence, in principle, if x and a_{ll} are known, the CP violating weak phase ϕ and the width difference related to y , can be determined from the ratios R_1 and R_2 ; $\sin \phi$ and y^2 are

the solutions of the following cubic equations:

$$4 \sin^3 \phi + n_f \frac{2(2\epsilon_1 - a_{ll}\epsilon_2)}{x_0} (\sin^2 \phi - 1) + (4\epsilon_2^2 + \epsilon_1^2 a_{ll}^2 - 4a_{ll}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 - 4) \sin \phi = 0 \quad (11)$$

$$(1 - y^2)^2 (4y^2 - \epsilon_1^2 a_{ll}^2 - 4\epsilon_2^2 + 4\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 a_{ll}) - \frac{1}{x_0^2} (4\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2 a_{ll}^2 - 4a_{ll}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2) y^2 = 0 \quad (12)$$

where, $x_0 = \frac{x}{1 + x^2}$.

Experimentally x is determined [12] using, either ΔM , measured by fits to the time dependent oscillation probabilities of a created B^0 decaying as a $B^0(\bar{B}^0)$, or from χ , the integrated probability of the same. Both these determinations already assume $\Delta\Gamma = 0$. In the ratios R_{1-4} , the value of x could be rewritten in terms of y and the observable χ , given by, $\chi = \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2(1 + x^2)}$. Equations analogous to Eq.(11,12), for $\sin \phi$ and y can also be written in terms of χ , instead of x_0 .

For B_d , it is expected that $y^2 \ll 1$; the above relations for $\sin \phi$ and y , then simplify to:

$$\sin \phi = n_f \frac{a_{ll}\epsilon_2 - 2\epsilon_1}{2x_0} \quad (13)$$

$$y = n_f \frac{(a_{ll}\epsilon_1 - 2\epsilon_2)x_0}{\sqrt{4x_0^2 - 4\epsilon_1^2 - \epsilon_2^2 a_{ll}^2 + 4a_{ll}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2}}. \quad (14)$$

In the limit $a_{ll} \rightarrow 0$, a signal of finite width difference is a nonzero value of ϵ_2 . We wish to emphasize that in this limit, *the determination of $\Delta\Gamma$ is independent of x* . Using $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_s$, in a sample of $10^7 \Upsilon$'s one can constrain $\sin(2\beta) < 0.32$ at 3σ (for $a_{ll} = 0, y^2 \ll 1$). Hence, it is possible to measure β over the entire currently allowed range. However, the same sample will provide a very weak constraint on the width difference. Combining $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_s$, $J/\psi K^*$ and $\psi(2S)K^*$ (with K^* seen in the $K_s\pi^0$ mode), to increase statistics, in a sample of $10^8 \Upsilon$'s, we obtain a sensitivity $\Delta\Gamma_d = (0.06, 0.16)\Gamma_d$ for $\beta = (10^\circ, 35^\circ)$ at 3σ (for $a_{ll} = 0$). Here we have assumed that one CP parity state is dominant in the $J/\psi K^*$ mode [14]. If separate CP parity states exist, they can still all be added, weighted by the corresponding CP parities [15]. Once ϕ is measured for various modes, the events for all the modes can be combined to determine y by introducing a weight factor of $1/\cos \phi$ corresponding to each mode.

In the B_s case, one anticipates $x_0 \ll 1$, moreover modes governed by $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$ (e.g. $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$) are expected to have a tiny weak phase, *i.e.*, $\phi \approx 0$. These modes can hence be used to determine the width difference for B_s through the relation,

$$y^2 = \epsilon_2^2 - \epsilon_1^2. \quad (15)$$

The above relation is *independent of the value of $|\xi|$ as well as x* . In fact, $|\xi|$ itself can be expressed as,

$$|\xi| = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1}}. \quad (16)$$

A comparison of the value of $|\xi|$ determined through this relation and that evaluated using the charge asymmetry in like sign dilepton events, would provide a useful consistency check. In the limit $a_{ll} \rightarrow 0$ and $\phi \approx 0$, one gets, $y = n_f \epsilon_2$. In such a case the sign of y can also be determined. To obtain sensitivity of $\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.2\Gamma_s$ would require 900 $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ tagged events produced at $\Upsilon(5S)$. The statistics can be significantly improved by combining the various modes involving the transition $b(\bar{b}) \rightarrow c\bar{c}s(\bar{s})$.

Non-CP eigenstate f : When it is experimentally feasible to distinguish f and $\bar{f}$, *e.g.* $B_d \rightarrow D^\pm\pi^\mp$, there is in principle enough information to extract all the unknown variables, including the weak phase and the width difference. This can be achieved by measuring the ratios $R_1, \dots, R_4$ and the analogous ratios where the f and $\bar{f}$ events are subtracted, giving a total of eight observables. The asymmetry, for a typical single mode *e.g.* $D^-\rho^+$, is $\sim 0.005 \sin(2\beta + \gamma)$ (using $a_{ll} = 0, y^2 \ll 1$ and factorization approximation). However, all modes involving the transition $b(\bar{b}) \rightarrow c\bar{u}d(\bar{c}u\bar{d})$, can be combined to improve statistics; the total branching ratio of such modes is of the order of a few percent, allowing for a possible observable asymmetry [16]. The decay mode $B_d \rightarrow DK_s$ is calculated to have a large asymmetry $\sim 0.3 \sin(2\beta + \gamma)$ in the factorization approximation. The constraint, $(2\beta + \gamma) < 55^\circ$ at 3σ can be obtained from 146 $B_d \rightarrow DK_s$ tagged events produced at $\Upsilon(4S)$ (assuming $a_{ll} = 0, y^2 \ll 1$). One of the difficulties encountered in CP violation studies involving a neutral D in the final state, *e.g.* $B_d \rightarrow D^0\pi^0, B_s \rightarrow D^0K_s$, is that it is

hard to identify the flavour of the D meson. In our technique, this poses no problem for a finite width difference, as the final states f and $\bar{f}$ can be added. If $a_{ll} \neq 0$ and $y \neq 0$, the four independent ratios $R_1, \dots, R_4$ can be used to determine, the weak phase, the width difference and the unknown product $r/(1+r^2)\cos\delta$. However, in case $a_{ll} = 0$ but $y \neq 0$, ϕ can be determined only with prior knowledge of y .

To conclude, we present a simple technique to measure both the CP violating weak phases as well as width differences of the two neutral B mass eigenstates using coherent $B_d\overline{B_d}$ or $B_s\overline{B_s}$ pairs, produced at the Υ resonances. This is achieved, without a detailed time study, considering only partial time integrated rates where the tag time is selectively ordered with respect to the decay time of the other B decaying hadronically to f . We construct certain ratios which signal CP violation and/or a lifetime difference, if different from half. Observation of such ratios can be used to cleanly measure the weak phase ϕ and the width difference $\Delta\Gamma$ simultaneously. The determination of the $\Delta\Gamma$ is independent of a measured value of the mass difference ΔM . This technique is applied to the case where f is a CP eigenstate such as in $J/\psi K_S$, as well as for a non- CP eigenstate, *e.g.* $D^0 K_s$. If a measurable width difference exists, our approach offers a particular advantage for final states involving a neutral D , since we can add D^0 and $\overline{D}^0$ events, which may not always be distinguishable.

We are very grateful to Prof. L. M. Sehgal for valuable suggestions. We also thank Prof. Tariq Aziz and Prof. G. Rajasekaran for discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [2] A. B. Carter and A. I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 952 (1980); Phys. Rev. D**23**, 1567 (1981); I. I. Bigi and A. I. Sanda, Nucl. Phys. B**193** 85 (1981); B**281**, 41 (1987); I. Dunietz and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D**34**, 1404 (1986).
- [3] I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D**52**, 3048 (1995); A. S. Dighe, I. Dunietz, H. J. Lipkin and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B**369**, 144 (1997); M. Beneke, G. Buchalla and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D**54**, 4419 (1996).
- [4] I. I. Bigi, CERN Report, CERN-TH.7282/94, May 1994; CERN Report, CERN-TH.7050/93, October 1993; I. I. Bigi, V. Khoze, N. G. Uraltsev, A.I. Sanda, in the review book *CP Violation*, ed. C. Jarlskog, World Scientific, Singapore(1989); Ya. I. Azimov, Phys. Rev. D**42** 3705 (1990); G. V. Dass and K. V. L. Sarma, Int.J.Mod.Phys. A**7** 6081 (1992); *ibid* A**8** 1183 (1993) (E); I. I. Bigi, B. Blok, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, A. Vainshtein, CERN Report, CERN-TH.7132/94, January 1994, in the second edition of the book *B Decays*, p. 132, ed. S. Stone, World Scientific, 1994, and references therein.
- [5] R. A. Bertlmann and W. Grimus, Phys. Lett B**392** 426 (1997); G. V. Dass and K. V. L. Sarma, hep-ph/9709249. In these references the mass difference of the two eigenstates used to find a bound on lifetime difference, itself assumes no lifetime difference exist.
- [6] A. J. Buras, W. Slominski and H. Steger, Nucl. Phys. B**245** 3 69 (1984).
- [7] R. Godang *et. al.*, CLEO Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3456 (1998).
- [8] J. O. Eeg, I. Picek, Z. Phys. C**39**, 521 (1988); A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D**56**, 1685 (1997).
- [9] I. I. Bigi and A. I. Sanda in Ref. [2]; R. Aleksan, *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. D**39**,1283 (1989); Zhi-Zhong Xing, Phys. Rev. D**53**, 204 (1996);

- [10] H. Quinn in *Particle Data Book*, R. M. Barnett *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. D**54**, 507 (1996).
- [11] J. Bartelt *et. al.* (CLEO collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1680 (1993).
- [12] R. M. Barnett *et. al.* in Ref. [10].
- [13] Zhi-zhong Xing, (talk given at the APCTP Workshop: Pacific Particle Physics Phenomenology, 31 Oct. - 2 Nov., 1997, Seoul, Korea), hep-ph/9712324.
- [14] C. P. Jessop *et. al.* (CLEO Collaboration) Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4533 (1997).
- [15] B. Kayser, M. Kuroda, R. D. Peccei, A. I. Sanda, Phys. Lett. **B237**, 508 (1990).
- [16] I. Dunietz, FERMILAB-PUB-97-384-T, Dec 1997, hep-ph/9712401.